

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-14 are presently pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, and 12 are amended. Claim 8 is cancelled without prejudice.

All of the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kranich. Claim 1 is amended to include "a bridge for determining whether the address corresponds to a first address space or a second address space by examining a particular bit in the address and performing one transaction after receiving a transaction with an address corresponding to the first address space and for performing two or more transactions after receiving a transaction with the address corresponding to the second address space."

Examiner has indicated that "Kranich teaches wherein the second logic circuit determines whether the address corresponds to the first address space or the second address space by examining a particular bit in the address (detect size, byte enable bits; 5/5-27)." Office Action, at 4. Assignee respectfully traverses and notes that the "enable bits" are not part of the address bits "AD[15:00]". Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Kranich does not teach or fairly suggest "a bridge for determining whether the address corresponds to a first address space or a second address space by examining a particular bit in the address and performing one transaction after receiving a transaction with an address corresponding to the first address space and for performing two or more transactions after receiving a transaction with the address corresponding to the second address space." (Emphasis Added).

Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 1 and dependent claims 2-5.

Additionally, claim 6, which was rejected on the same basis as claim 1, recites, among other limitations, "determining whether the target address corresponds to the first address space or the second address space by examining a particular bit in the address" (Emphasis Added). Claim 9 which was rejected on the same basis as claim 1, recites among other limitations, "determining whether the address corresponds to the first address space or the second address space by examining a particular bit in the address" (Emphasis Added). It is respectfully submitted that Kranich does not teach the foregoing and accordingly, Assignee requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 6 and 9, and dependent claims 7, and 10-14.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee submits that each of the pending claims are now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance.

It is believed that all monies for the actions described herein are provided with this correspondence. To the extent that additional monies are required for any of the actions requested in the correspondence, Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees and credit any overpayments to deposit account 13-0017.

Respectfully Submitted



Mirut Dalal
Attorney for Assignee
Reg. No. 44,052

February 26, 2007

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison - Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000
FAX (312) 775-8100